

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-39 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 21, 26, 28, 31, 33, 36, 37, 38, and 39 are currently amended. Claims 2, 6, and 8 were previously cancelled in a previous Office Action Response.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 19, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28-31, 33 and 36-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weeks et al. (WO 94/11967 A1 herein after Weeks) in view of Rautila (U.S. Pat. 6,714,797). In a telephone interview, Examiner Eng explained that since in Weeks' reference a user dials a reference number to receive information about a specific object (the object's reference number is entered into Weeks' cellular telephone), and since this action caused a central computer server to recognize the specific telephone being used by means of the cellular telephone's own telephone number, he considered the telephone number to be a user's attribute. Examiner Eng further explained that by this interpretation, the entering of an object's reference number was equivalent to a service request, and the automatic inclusion of the telephones ID (i.e. telephone number) was equivalent to the addition of a user attribute. At this point, Applicants noted to Examiner Eng that the language of claim 1 further requires that the user attributes be "user-provided user attributes", and that these "user-provided user attributes" be stored in the portable device's "second memory". Clearly, neither the cellular telephone's number nor any other identification involved in establishing a communication link between the telephone and the central server is "user-provided". Furthermore, more, none of the cited references taught or suggested storing these "user-provided use attributes" in order for them to be added to an automated service request. Examiner Eng conceded that this appeared to be the case, but suggested that the broad claim language might be confusing the issue. Examiner Eng suggested that he would be willing to reconsider the invention's novelty if language defining the user-attributes as "user-favorites" or "user preferences", which would make clear that the user-attributes correspond to personal preferences of the user. In accordance with the Examiner's request, 1, 9, 11, 19, 21, 26, 28, 31, 33, 36, 37, 38, and 39 are amended to more clearly state that the user-provided

user attributes included with the service information request are "user preferences".

Additionally, claims 5, 10, 20, 27, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weeks et al. in view of Rautila as applied above, and further in view of Ilen (WO 95/11496 A1). In the telephone interview, Examiner Eng explained that his understanding of the Ilen reference is that card-key reader box 1 is a portable device installed in a user's car, and which communicates with a remote gate door. Applicants respectfully disagreed, and noted that Ilen shows a that card key 3 is entered into card-key reader box 1, such that it is irrational to assume that card-key reader box 1 is portable and installed in a user's car, if the user still needs to insert a card-key into the box. More correctly, card-key reader box 1 is located along a travel path in front of the gate, and a user drives up to box 1 and inserts his card-key 3. This interpretation of it supported by Ilen. Specifically, in page 3, lines 28-33, Ilen states,

"At both the entrance and the exit ... there are control device 4 including barrier 6 communicating with the car specific parking fee device..."

Here, Ilen clearly states that both the "control device 4" and the "car specific parking fee device" are situated at both the entrance and the exit. In page 3, lines 18-19, Ilen further defines, "a car-specific parking-fee device 1" as box 1. Thus, it is evident from the above excerpt that both box 1 (i.e. car-specific parking-fee device 1) and box 4 (control device 4) are stationary and situated at the entrance and exit of a parking area. Lastly, Ilen devices the card-key 3, as (page 4, lines 3-5) "A 'function card' is here a card from which information can be read into a parking-fee device via a card-reading device [1]".

Perhaps confusion arose from Ilen's use of the phrase, "car-specific parking-fee device 1", which might appear to imply that each car would have a separate card reader, but this is illogical. Since Ilen requires a separate card reader 1 at the entrance an exit of a parking area, more likely what Ilen meant is that no more than one car at a time is permitted to use his card-reader 1. In this

manner, when a user enters his key-card, the information read by card-reader 1 would correspond specifically to the user.

Furthermore, claims 3, 4, 13-17, 22, 23, 29-30, 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weeks et al. in view of Rautila as applied above, and further in view of Tanabe (JP 10315971A). As was explained in a previous Office Action response, Tanabe describes a system that broadcasts a train station's train schedule information generically. Tanabe does not broadcast any user-specific information. Furthermore, Tanabe does not have any information regarding the user's destination, nor any information regarding transfer points (at other stations) or transfer points to other types of transportation. In the present invention, the specification explains that since part the user-specific attributes is a submission of the user's destination, the central transmitting base can recommend various transfer points at distant stations (train stations or otherwise) or other forms of transportation for best reaching the user's destination. For example, at least claims 4, 13, 14, 22, 23, 29, 30, 34, and 35 specify that the first memory holds information on various types of "transportation means" (not just train schedules), "transfer points", "transfer options at said various transfer points" for traveling from a specific departure point to a specific destination point. Clearly, Tanabe's radio broadcast has no information about other train stations or bus stations or airports (i.e. "transportation means" and "transfer options". Claim 15 further specifies that the type of transmitted information may cover details such as specifying what stairs, escalators or elevators are available to the user. Claim 16 additionally explains that the information may further include expected wait delays at transfer points, and claim 17 clarifies that various transportation means included in the information covers train, bus, airplane, or ship information. Clearly, Tanabe's radio broadcast, which is merely a recitation of its daily train schedule does not teach or suggest this type of detailed information, or information on other transportation stations (train, bus, airplane, ship, etc.).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Rosalio Haro

Registration No. 42,633

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.

Intellectual Property Department

150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225

San Jose, CA 95134

Phone: (408) 952-6000

Facsimile: (408) 954-9058

Customer No. 20178

Date: September 15, 2005